

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, as amended, remain herein.

Editorial changes have been made in claims 1-13.

1. The specification has been edited to include section headings and to correct a minor typographical error.

2. The Abstract has been edited.

3. Claim 1 has been reworded and properly punctuated, thereby mooting its objection.

4. Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Synnestvedt et al. U.S. Patent 6,598,057.

The presently claimed method is for configuring an automation module on a TCP/IP network to which at least one item of automation equipment also is connected, and in sequence includes: (1) assigning an application name for the automation module, the application name being unique on the TCP/IP network,

(2) sending by the automation module a request address query on the TCP/IP network, the request address query comprising the application name of the automation module and being in conformance with DHCP protocol, and (3) sending by the automation module a read configuration query in conformance with FTP or TFTP protocol, on the TCP/IP network, to an FTP/TFTP server. This method is nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

The Office Action cites Synnestvedt et al. '057 as allegedly disclosing a method for configuring an automation module on a TCP/IP network to which at least one item of automation equipment also is connected. Actually, Synnestvedt et al. '057 describes a method for cable modem configuration file management via a network connected server, and does not disclose an automation module on a TCP/IP network to which at least one item of automation equipment also is connected, as recited in applicants' claim 1 and described in applicants' specification, page 6, lines 1-17. Synnestvedt et al. '057, Fig. 1, shows cable modem 102, router 106, Internet 108, and Internet server 110, and in Figs. 3 and 4 describes a method for

Serial No. 09/973,068

updating the configuration of the cable modem, but does not disclose all of the elements recited in applicants' claim 1.

Thus, Synnestvedt et al. '057 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under §102. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in Synnestvedt et al. '057 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 2-13, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

All claims 1-13 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection stated in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 1-13 is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/973,068

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

April 21, 2005

Date



Roger W. Parkhurst
Registration No. 25,177

RWP/mhs

Attorney Docket No.: 028954.2009

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1130 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1795
Telephone: 202-429-3000
Facsimile: 202-429-3902